

White Paper
Concerning Male Physiological and Performance Advantages
in Athletic Competition
and
The Effect of Testosterone Suppression on Male Athletic Advantage

GREGORY A. BROWN, Ph.D.

December 14, 2021

Personal Qualifications 1

Overview 3

I. Biological men, or adolescent boys, have large, well-documented performance advantages over women and adolescent girls in almost all athletic contests. . 5

 A. Men are stronger. 8

 B. Men run faster. 9

 C. Men jump higher and farther. 12

 D. Men throw, hit, and kick faster and farther. 12

 E. Males exhibit faster reaction times. 13

II. Men have large measured physiological differences compared to women which demonstrably or likely explain their performance advantages..... 14

 A. Men are taller and heavier than women 14

 B. Males have larger and longer bones, stronger bones, and different bone configuration..... 14

 C. Males have much larger muscle mass. 16

 D. Females have a larger proportion of body fat. 16

 E. Males are able to metabolize and release energy to muscles at a higher rate due to larger heart and lung size, and higher hemoglobin concentrations. 17

III. The role of testosterone in the development of male advantages in athletic performance..... 20

 A. Boys exhibit advantages in athletic performance even before puberty. 20

 B. The rapid increase in testosterone across male puberty drives characteristic male physiological changes and the increasing performance advantages. 24

IV.	The available evidence shows that suppression of testosterone in a male after puberty has occurred does not substantially eliminate the male athletic advantage.	26
A.	Empirical studies find that males retain a strong performance advantage even after lengthy testosterone suppression.....	26
B.	Testosterone suppression does not reverse important male physiological advantages.	32
C.	Responsible voices internationally are increasingly recognizing that suppression of testosterone in a male after puberty has occurred does not substantially reverse the male athletic advantage.	36
	CONCLUSIONS	41

Bibliography

Personal Qualifications

I serve as Professor of Exercise Science in the Department of Kinesiology and Sport Sciences at the University of Nebraska Kearney, where I teach classes in Exercise Physiology among other topics. I have served as a tenured (and nontenured) professor at universities since 2002.

In August 2002, I received a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Iowa State University, where I majored in Health and Human Performance, with an emphasis in the Biological Bases of Physical Activity. In May 1999, I received a Master of Science degree from Iowa State University, where I majored in Exercise and Sport Science, with an emphasis in Exercise Physiology.

I have received many awards over the years, including the Mortar Board Faculty Excellence Honors Award, College of Education Outstanding Scholarship / Research Award, and the College of Education Award for Faculty Mentoring of Undergraduate Student Research. I have authored more than 40 refereed publications and more than 50 refereed presentations in the field of Exercise Science. I have authored chapters for multiple books in the field of Exercise Science. And I have served as a peer reviewer for over 25 professional journals, including *The American Journal of Physiology*, the *International Journal of Exercise Science*, the *Journal of Strength and Conditioning*, and *The Journal of Applied Physiology*.

My areas of research have included the endocrine response to testosterone prohormone supplements in men and women, the effects of testosterone prohormone supplements on health and the adaptations to strength training in men, the effects of energy drinks on the physiological response to exercise, and assessment of various athletic training modes in males and females. Articles that I have published that are closely related to topics that I discuss in this white paper include:

- Studies of the effect of ingestion of a testosterone precursor on circulating testosterone levels in young men. Douglas S. King, Rick L. Sharp, Matthew D. Vukovich, Gregory A. Brown, et al., *Effect of Oral Androstenedione on Serum Testosterone and Adaptations to Resistance Training in Young Men: A Randomized Controlled Trial*, JAMA 281: 2020-2028 (1999); G. A. Brown, M. A. Vukovich, et al., *Effects of Anabolic Precursors on Serum Testosterone Concentrations and Adaptations to Resistance Training in Young Men*, INT J SPORT NUTR EXERC METAB 10: 340-359 (2000).
- A study of the effect of ingestion of that same testosterone precursor on circulating testosterone levels in young women. G. A. Brown, J. C. Dewey, et al., *Changes in Serum Testosterone and Estradiol*

Concentrations Following Acute Androstenedione Ingestion in Young Women, HORM METAB RES 36: 62-66 (2004.)

- A study finding (among other things) that body height, body mass, vertical jump height, maximal oxygen consumption, and leg press maximal strength were higher in a group of physically active men than comparably active women, while the women had higher percent body fat. G. A. Brown, Michael W. Ray, et al., *Oxygen Consumption, Heart Rate, and Blood Lactate Responses to an Acute Bout of Plyometric Depth Jumps in College-Aged Men And Women*, J. STRENGTH COND RES 24: 2475-2482 (2010).
- A study finding (among other things) that height, body mass, and maximal oxygen consumption were higher in a group of male NCAA Division 2 distance runners, while women NCAA Division 2 distance runners had higher percent body fat. Furthermore, these male athletes had a faster mean competitive running speed (~3.44 min/km) than women (~3.88 km/min), even though the men ran 10 km while the women ran 6 km. Katherine Semin, Alvah C. Stahlnecker, Kate A. Heelan, G. A. Brown, et al, *Discrepancy Between Training, Competition and Laboratory Measures of Maximum Heart Rate in NCAA Division 2 Distance Runners*, JOURNAL OF SPORTS SCIENCE AND MEDICINE 7: 455-460 (2008).
- A presentation at the 2021 American Physiological Society New Trends in Sex and Gender Medicine Conference entitled “Transwomen Competing in Women’s Sports: What We Know and What We Don’t”. I have also authored an August 2021 entry for the American Physiological Society Physiology Educators Community of Practice Blog (PECOP Blog) titled “The Olympics, Sex, and Gender in the Physiology Classroom.”

The opinions I express in this white paper are my own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of my employer, the University of Nebraska.

Overview

In this white paper, I explore three important questions relevant to current discussions and policy decisions concerning inclusion of transgender individuals in women's athletic competitions. Based on my professional familiarity with exercise physiology and my review of the currently available science, including that contained in the many academic sources I cite in this white paper, I set out and explain three basic conclusions:

- At the level of elite, collegiate, scholastic, and recreational competition, men, or adolescent boys, have an advantage over equally aged and trained women, or adolescent girls, in almost all athletic contests;
- Biological male physiology is the basis for the performance advantage that men, or adolescent boys, have over women, or adolescent girls, in almost all athletic contests; and
- Administration of androgen inhibitors and cross-sex hormones to men, or adolescent boys, after male puberty, and administration of testosterone to women or adolescent girls, after female puberty, do not eliminate the performance advantage of men or adolescent boys over women or adolescent girls in almost all athletic contests.

In short summary, men, and adolescent boys, perform better in almost all sports than women, and adolescent girls, because of their inherent physiological advantages that develop during male puberty. In general, men, and adolescent boys, can run faster, output more muscular power, jump higher, and possess greater muscular endurance than women, and adolescent girls.

Indeed, while after the onset of puberty males are on average taller and heavier than females, a male performance advantage over females has been measured in weightlifting competitions even between males and females matched for body mass.

Male advantages in tests of physical fitness and athletic performance have been shown in children before puberty. These advantages are magnified during puberty, triggered in large part by the higher testosterone concentrations in men, and adolescent boys, after the onset of male puberty. Under the influence of high testosterone levels, adolescent boys and young men develop more muscle mass, greater muscle strength, less body fat, higher bone mineral density, greater bone strength, higher hemoglobin concentrations, larger hearts and larger coronary blood vessels, and larger overall statures than women. In addition, maximal oxygen consumption ($VO_2\max$), which correlates to ~30-40% of success in endurance sports,

is higher in both elite and average men and boys than in comparable women and girls when measured in regard to absolute volume of oxygen consumed and when measured relative to body mass.

Although androgen deprivation (that is, testosterone suppression) may modestly decrease some physiological advantages that men and adolescent boys have over women and adolescent girls, it cannot fully or even largely eliminate those physiological advantages once an individual has passed through male puberty.

Evidence and Conclusions

I. Biological men, or adolescent boys, have large, well-documented performance advantages over women and adolescent girls in almost all athletic contests.

1. It should scarcely be necessary to invoke scientific experts to “prove” that men are on average larger, stronger, and faster than women. All of us, along with our siblings and our peers and perhaps our children, have passed through puberty, and we have watched that differentiation between the sexes occur. This is common human experience and knowledge.

2. Nevertheless, these differences have been extensively studied and measured. I cited many of these studies in the first paper on this topic that I prepared, which was submitted in litigation in January 2020. Since then, in light of current controversies, several authors have compiled valuable collections or reviews of data extensively documenting this objective fact about the human species, as manifest in almost all sports, each of which I have reviewed and found informative. These include Coleman (2020), Hilton & Lundberg (2021), World Rugby (2020), Harper (2021), Hamilton (2021), and a “Briefing Book” prepared by the Women’s Sports Policy Working Group (2021). The important paper by Handelsman et al. (2018) also gathers scientific evidence of the systematic and large male athletic advantage.

3. These papers and many others document that men, and adolescent boys, substantially outperform comparably aged women, and adolescent girls, in competitions involving running speed, swimming speed, cycling speed, jumping height, jumping distance, and strength (to name a few, but not all, of the performance differences). As I discuss later, it is now clear that these performance advantages for men, and adolescent boys, are inherent to the biological differences between the sexes.

4. In fact, I am not aware of any scientific evidence today that disproves that after puberty men possess large advantages in athletic performance over women—so large that they are generally insurmountable for comparably gifted and trained athletes at every level. And I am not aware of any scientific evidence today that disproves that these measured performance advantages are at least largely the result of physiological differences between men and women which have been measured and are reasonably well understood.

5. My use of the term “advantage” in this paper must not be read to imply any normative judgment. The adult female physique is simply different from the adult male physique. Obviously, it is optimized in important respects for the

difficult task of childbearing. On average, women require far fewer calories for healthy survival. Evolutionary biologists can and do theorize about the survival value or “advantages” provided by these and other distinctive characteristics of the female physique, but I will leave that to the evolutionary biologists. I use “advantage” to refer merely to performance advantages in athletic competitions.

6. I find in the literature a widespread consensus that the large performance and physiological advantages possessed by males—rather than social considerations or considerations of identity—are precisely the *reason* that most athletic competitions are separated by sex, with women treated as a “protected class.” To cite only a few statements accepting this as the justification:

- Handelsman et al. (2018) wrote, “Virtually all elite sports are segregated into male and female competitions. The main justification is to allow women a chance to win, as women have major disadvantages against men who are, on average, taller, stronger, and faster and have greater endurance due to their larger, stronger, muscles and bones as well as a higher circulating hemoglobin level.” (803)
- Millard-Stafford et al. (2018) wrote “Current evidence suggests that women will not swim or run as fast as men in Olympic events, which speaks against eliminating sex segregation in these individual sports” (530) “Given the historical context (2% narrowing in swimming over 44 y), a reasonable assumption might be that no more than 2% of the current performance gap could still potentially be attributed to sociocultural influences.”, (533) and “Performance gaps between US men and women stabilized within less than a decade after federal legislation provided equal opportunities for female participation, but only modestly closed the overall gap in Olympic swimming by 2% (5% in running).” (533) Dr. Millard-Stafford, a full professor at Georgia Tech, holds a Ph.D. in Exercise Physiology and is a past President of the American College of Sports Medicine.
- In 2021, Hilton et al. wrote, “most sports have a female category the purpose of which is the protection of both fairness and, in some sports, safety/welfare of athletes who do not benefit from the physiological changes induced by male levels of testosterone from puberty onwards.” (204)

- In 2020 the Swiss High Court (“Tribunal Fédéral”) observed that “in most sports . . . women and men compete in two separate categories, because the latter possess natural advantages in terms of physiology.”¹
- The members of the Women’s Sports Policy Working Group wrote that “If sports were not sex segregated, female athletes would rarely be seen in finals or on victory podiums,” and that “We have separate sex sport and eligibility criteria based on biological sex because this is the only way we can assure that female athletes have the same opportunities as male athletes not only to participate but to win in competitive sport. . . . If we did not separate athletes on the basis of biological sex—if we used any other physical criteria—we would never see females in finals or on podiums.” (WSPWG Briefing Book 2021 at 5, 20.)
- In 2021, the World Rugby organization stated that “the women's category exists to ensure protection, safety and equality for those who do not benefit from the biological advantage created by these biological performance attributes. (World Rugby 2021 at 15)
- In 2021 Harper et al. stated “...the small decrease in strength in transwomen after 12–36 months of GAHT [Gender Affirming Hormone Therapy] suggests that transwomen likely retain a strength advantage over cisgender women.” (7) and “...observations in trained transgender individuals are consistent with the findings of the current review in untrained transgender individuals, whereby 30 months of GAHT may be sufficient to attenuate some, but not all, influencing factors associated with muscular endurance and performance.” (8)
- Hamilton et al. (2021), in a consensus statement for the International Federation of Sports Medicine (FIMS) concluded that “Transwomen have the right to compete in sports. However, cisgender women have the right to compete in a protected category.” (1409)

7. While the sources I mention above gather more extensive scientific evidence of this uncontroversial truth, I provide here a brief summary of representative facts concerning the male advantage in athletic performance.

¹ “dans la plupart des sports . . . les femmes et les hommes concourent dans deux catégories séparées, ces derniers étant naturellement avantagés du point de vue physique.” Tribunal Fédéral decision of August 25, 2020, Case 4A_248/2019, 4A_398/2019, at §9.8.3.3.

A. Men are stronger.

8. Males exhibit greater strength throughout the body. Both Handelsman et al. (2018) and Hilton & Lundberg (2021) have gathered multiple literature references that document this fact in various muscle groups.

9. **Grip strength** is often used as a useful proxy for strength more generally. In one study, moderately trained men showed on average 57% greater grip strength than women. (Bohannon 2019.) A wider meta-analysis of multiple grip-strength studies not limited to athletic populations found that 18- and 19-year-old males exhibited in the neighborhood of 2/3 greater grip strength than females. (Handelsman 2017 Figure 3, summarizing Silverman 2011 Table 1.)²

10. Men have in the neighborhood of 60%-100% greater **arm strength** than women. (Handelsman 2018 at 812.)³ One study of elbow flexion strength (basically, bringing the fist up towards the shoulder) in a large sample of men and women found that men exhibited 109% greater isometric strength, and 89% higher strength in a single repetition. (Hilton 2021 at 204, summarizing Hubal (2005) at Table 2.)

11. In an evaluation of maximal isometric handgrip strength in 1,654 healthy men, 533 healthy women aged 20-25 years and 60 “highly trained elite female athletes from sports known to require high hand-grip forces (judo, handball),” Leyk et al. (2007) observed that “The results of female national elite athletes even indicate that the strength level attainable by extremely high training will rarely surpass the 50th percentile of untrained or not specifically trained men” (Leyk 2007 at 415-416.)

12. Men have in the neighborhood of 25%-60% greater **leg strength** than women. (Handelsman 2018 at 812.) In another measure, Men exhibit 54% greater knee extension torque and this male leg strength advantage is consistent across the lifespan. (Neder 1999 at 120-121.)

² Citing Silverman, *The secular trend for grip strength in Canada and the United States*, J. Ports Sci. 29:599-606 (2011).

³ Handelsman expresses this as women having 50% to 60% of the “upper limb” strength of men. Handelsman cites Sale, *Neuromuscular function*, for this figure and the “lower limb” strength figure. Knox et al., *Transwomen in elite sport* (2018) are probably confusing the correct way to state percentages when they state that “differences lead to decreased trunk and lower body strength by 64% and 72% respectively, in women” (397): interpreted literally, this would imply that men have **almost 4x as much** lower body strength as do women.

13. When male and female Olympic weightlifters of the same body weight are compared, the top males lift weights between 30% and 40% larger than the females of the same body weight. But when top male and female performances are compared in powerlifting, without imposing any artificial limitations on bodyweight, the male record is 65% higher than the female record. (Hilton 2021 at 203.)

14. In another measure that combines many muscle groups as well as weight and speed, moderately trained males generated 162% greater punching power than females even though men do not possess this large an advantage in any single bio-mechanical variable. (Morris 2020.) This objective reality was subjectively summed up by women's mixed-martial arts fighter Tamikka Brents, who suffered significant facial injuries when she fought against a biological male who identified as female and fought under the name of Fallon Fox. Describing the experience, Brents said:

“I’ve fought a lot of women and have never felt the strength that I felt in a fight as I did that night. I can’t answer whether it’s because she was born a man or not because I’m not a doctor. I can only say, I’ve never felt so overpowered ever in my life, and I am an abnormally strong female in my own right.”⁴

B. Men run faster.

15. Many scholars have detailed the wide performance advantages enjoyed by men in running speed. One can come at this reality from a variety of angles.


16. Multiple authors report a male speed advantage in the neighborhood of 10%-13% in a variety of events, with a variety of study populations. Handelsman et al. 2018 at 813 and Handelsman 2017 at 70 both report a male advantage of about 10% by age 17. Thibault et al. 2010 at 217 similarly reported a stable 10% performance advantage across multiple events at the Olympic level. Tønnessen et al. at 1-2 surveyed the data and found a consistent male advantage of 10%-12% in running events after the completion of puberty. They document this for both short sprints and longer distances. One group of authors found that the male advantage increased dramatically in ultra-long-distance competition. Lepers & Knechtle 2013.

17. A great deal of current interest has been focused on track events. It is worth noting that a recent analysis of publicly available sports federation and tournament records found that men enjoy the *least* advantage in running events, as compared to a range of other events and metrics, including jumping, pole vaulting,

⁴ <http://whoatv.com/exclusive-fallon-foxs-latest-opponent-opens-up-to-whoatv/> (last accessed October 5, 2021).

tennis serve speed, golf drives, baseball pitching speed, and weightlifting. (Hilton 2021 at 201-202.) Nevertheless, as any serious runner will recognize, the approximately 10% male advantage in running is an overwhelming difference. Dr. Hilton calculates that “approximately 10,000 males have personal best times that are faster than the current Olympic 100m female champion.” (Hilton 2021 at 204.) Professors Doriane Coleman, Jeff Wald, Wickliffe Shreve, and Richard Clark dramatically illustrated this by compiling the data and creating the figure below (last accessed on December 10, 2021, at <https://bit.ly/35yOyS4>), which shows that the *lifetime best performances* of three female Olympic champions in the 400m event—including Team USA’s Sanya Richards-Ross and Allyson Felix—would not match the performances of literally thousands of boys and men, *just in 2017 alone*, including many who would not be considered top tier male performers:

Comparing the Best Elite Females to Boys and Men:
Personal Bests for 3 Female Gold Medalists versus 2017 Performances by Boys and Men



18. Professor Coleman and her colleague Wicklyffe Shreve also created the table below (last accessed on December 10, 2021, at <https://bit.ly/37E1s2X>), which compares the number of men—males over 18—whose results in each event in 2017 would have ranked them above the very best elite woman that year.

TABLE 2 – World’s Best Woman v. Number of Men Outperforming			
Event	Best Women’s Result	Best Men’s Result	# of Men Outperforming
100 Meters	10.71	9.69	2,474
200 Meters	21.77	19.77	2,920
400 Meters	49.46	43.62	4,341
800 Meters	1:55.16*	1:43.10	3,992+
1500 Meters	3:56.14	3:28.80	3,216+
3000 Meters	8:23.14	7:28.73	1307+
5000 Meters	14:18.37	12:55.23	1,243
High Jump	2.06 meters	2.40 meters	777
Pole Vault	4.91 meters	6.00 meters	684
Long Jump	7.13 meters	8.65 meters	1,652
Triple Jump	14.96 meters	18.11 meters	969

19. The male advantage becomes insuperable well before the developmental changes of puberty are complete. Dr. Hilton documents that even “schoolboys”—defined as age 15 and under—have beaten the female world records in running, jumping, and throwing events. (Hilton 2021 at 204.)

20. Similarly, Coleman and Shreve created the table below (last accessed on December 10, 2021, at <https://bit.ly/37E1s2X>), which “compares the number of boys—males under the age of 18—whose results in each event in 2017 would rank them above the single very best elite [adult] woman that year.”

TABLE 1 – World’s Best Woman v. Under 18 Boys			
Event	Best Women’s Result	Best Boys’ Result	# of Boys Outperforming
100 Meters	10.71	10.15	124 ⁺
200 Meters	21.77	20.51	182
400 Meters	49.46	45.38	285
800 Meters	1:55.16*	1:46.3	201+
1500 Meters	3:56.14	3:37.43	101+
3000 Meters	8:23.14	7:38.90	30
5000 Meters	14:18.37	12:55.58	15
High Jump	2.06 meters	2.25 meters	28
Pole Vault	4.91 meters	5.31 meters	10
Long Jump	7.13 meters	7.88 meters	74
Triple Jump	14.96 meters	17.30 meters	47

21. In an analysis I have performed of running events (consisting of the 100 m, 200 m, 400 m, 800 m, 1500 m, 5000 m, and 10000 m) in the Division 1,

Division 2, and Division 3 NCAA Outdoor championships for the years of 2010-2019, the average performance across all events of the 1st place man was 14.1% faster than the 1st place woman, with the smallest difference being a 10.2% advantage for men in the Division 1 100 m race. The average 8th place man across all events (the last place to earn the title of All American) was 11.2% faster than 1st place woman, with the smallest difference being a 6.5% advantage for men in the Division 1 100 m race. (Brown et al. Unpublished observations, to be presented at the 2022 Annual Meeting of the American College of Sports Medicine.)

C. Men jump higher and farther.

22. Jumping involves both leg strength and speed as positive factors, with body weight of course a factor working against jump height. Despite their substantially greater body weight, males enjoy an even greater advantage in jumping than in running. Handelsman 2018 at 813, looking at youth and young adults, and Thibault 2010 at 21, looking at Olympic performances, both found male advantages in the range of 15%-20%. See also Tønnessen 2015 (approximately 19%); Handelsman 2017 (19%); Hilton 2021 at 201 (18%). Looking at the vertical jump called for in volleyball, research on elite volleyball players found that males jumped on average 50% higher during an “attack” at the net than did females. (Sattler 2015; see also Hilton 2021 at 203 (33% higher vertical jump).)

23. The combined male advantage of body height and jump height means, for example, that a total of six women in the WNBA have ever dunked a basketball in the regulation 10 foot hoop, while the ability to dunk appears to be almost universal among NBA players: “Since the 1996–97 season (the earliest data is available from Basketball-Reference.com), 1,801 different [NBA] players have combined for 210,842 regular-season dunks, and 1,259 out of 1,367 players (or 92%) who have played at least 1,000 minutes have dunked at least once,”⁵

D. Men throw, hit, and kick faster and farther.

24. Strength, arm-length, and speed combine to give men a large advantage over women in throwing. This has been measured in a number of studies.

25. One study of elite male and female baseball pitchers showed that men throw baseballs 35% faster than women—81 miles/hour for men vs. 60 miles/hour for women. (Chu 2009.) “By age 12, boys’ throwing velocity is already between 3.5 and 4 standard deviation units higher than the girls.” (Thomas 1985 at 276.) By age

⁵ <https://www.si.com/nba/2021/02/22/nba-non-dunkers-patty-mills-tj-mcconnell-steve-novak-daily-cover>

seventeen, the *average* male can throw a ball farther than 99% of seventeen-year-old females. (Lombardo 2018; Chu 2009; Thomas 1985 at 222.) Looking at publicly available data, Hilton & Lundberg found that in both baseball pitching and the field hockey “drag flick,” the *record* ball speeds achieved by males are more than 50% higher than those achieved by females. (Hilton 2021 at 202-203.)

26. Men achieve serve speeds in tennis more than 15% faster than women; and likewise in golf achieve ball speeds off the tee more than 15% faster than women. (Hilton 2021 at 202.)

27. Males are able to throw a javelin more than 30% farther than females. (Lombardo 2018 Table 2; Hilton 2021 at 203.)

28. Men serve and spike volleyballs with higher velocity than women, with a performance advantage in the range of 29-34%. (Hilton 2021 at 204 Fig. 1.)

29. Men are also able to kick balls harder and faster. A study comparing collegiate soccer players found that males kick the ball with an average 20% greater velocity than females. (Sakamoto 2014.)

E. Males exhibit faster reaction times.

30. Interestingly, men enjoy an additional advantage over women in reaction time—an attribute not obviously related to strength or metabolism (e.g. $\dot{V}O_2$ max). “Reaction time in sports is crucial in both simple situations such as the gun shot in sprinting and complex situations when a choice is required. In many team sports this is the foundation for tactical advantages which may eventually determine the outcome of a game.” (Dogan 2009 at 92.) “Reaction times can be an important determinant of success in the 100m sprint, where medals are often decided by hundredths or even thousandths of a second.” (Tonnessen 2013 at 885.)

31. The existence of a sex-linked difference in reaction times is consistent over a wide range of ages and athletic abilities. (Dykiert 2012). Even by the age of 4 or 5, in a ruler-drop test, males have been shown to exhibit 4% to 6% faster reaction times than females. (Latorre-Roman 2018). In high school athletes taking a common baseline “ImPACT” test, males showed 3% faster reaction times than females. (Mormile 2018.) Researchers have found a 6% male advantage in reaction times of both first-year medical students (Jain 2014) and world-class sprinters (Tonnessen 2013).

32. Most studies of reaction times use computerized tests which ask participants to hit a button on a keyboard or to say something in response to a stimulus. One study on NCAA athletes measured “reaction time” by a criterion perhaps more closely related to athletic performance—that is, how fast athletes covered 3.3 meters after a starting signal. Males covered the 3.3 meters 10% faster

than females in response to a visual stimulus, and 16% faster than females in response to an auditory stimulus. (Spierer 2010.)

33. Researchers have speculated that sex-linked differences in brain structure, as well as estrogen receptors in the brain, may be the source of the observed male advantage in reaction times, but at present this remains a matter of speculation and hypothesis. (Mormile at 19; Spierer at 962.)

II. Men have large measured physiological differences compared to women which demonstrably or likely explain their performance advantages.

34. No single physiological characteristic alone accounts for all or any one of the measured advantages that men enjoy in athletic performance. However, scientists have identified and measured a number of physiological factors that contribute to superior male performance.

A. Men are taller and heavier than women

35. In some sports, such as basketball and volleyball, height itself provides competitive advantage. While some women are taller than some men, based on data from 20 countries in North America, Europe, East Asia, and Australia the 50th percentile for body height for women is 164.7 cm (5 ft 5 inches) and the 50th percentile for body height for men is 178.4 cm (5 ft 10 inches). Helping to illustrate the inherent height difference between men and women, from the same data analysis, the 95th percentile for body height for women is 178.9 cm (5 feet 10.43 inches), which is only 0.5 cm taller than the 50th percentile for men (178.4 cm; 5 feet 10.24 inches), while the 95th percentile for body height for men is 193.6 cm (6 feet 4.22 inches). (Roser 2013.)

36. To look at a specific athletic population, an evaluation of NCAA Division 1 basketball players compared 68 male guards and 59 male forwards to 105 female guards and 91 female forwards, and found that the male guards were 187.4 ± 7.0 cm tall and weighed 85.2 ± 7.4 kg while the female guards were 171.6 ± 5.0 cm tall and weighed 68.0 ± 7.4 kg. The male forwards were 201.7 ± 4.0 cm tall and weighed 105.3 ± 5.9 kg while the female forwards were 183.5 ± 4.4 cm tall and weighed 82.2 ± 12.5 kg. (Fields 2018 at 3.)

B. Males have larger and longer bones, stronger bones, and different bone configuration.

37. Obviously, males on average have longer bones. “Sex differences in height have been the most thoroughly investigated measure of bone size, as adult

height is a stable, easily quantified measure in large population samples. Extensive twin studies show that adult height is highly heritable with predominantly additive genetic effects that diverge in a sex-specific manner from the age of puberty onwards.” (Handelsman 2018 at 818.) “Pubertal testosterone exposure leads to an ultimate average greater height in men of 12–15 centimeters, larger bones, greater muscle mass, increased strength and higher hemoglobin levels.” (Gooren 2011 at 653.)

38. “Men have distinctively greater bone size, strength, and density than do women of the same age. As with muscle, sex differences in bone are absent prior to puberty but then accrue progressively from the onset of male puberty due to the sex difference in exposure to adult male circulating testosterone concentrations.” (Handelsman 2018 at 818.)

39. “[O]n average men are 7% to 8% taller with longer, denser, and stronger bones, whereas women have shorter humerus and femur cross-sectional areas being 65% to 75% and 85%, respectively, those of men.” (Handelsman 2018 at 818.)

40. Greater height, leg, and arm length themselves provide obvious advantages in several sports. But male bone geometry also provides less obvious advantages. “The major effects of men’s larger and stronger bones would be manifest via their taller stature as well as the larger fulcrum with greater leverage for muscular limb power exerted in jumping, throwing, or other explosive power activities.” (Handelsman 2018 at 818.)

41. Male advantage in bone size is not limited to length, as larger bones provide the mechanical framework for larger muscle mass. “From puberty onwards, men have, on average, 10% more bone providing more surface area. The larger surface area of bone accommodates more skeletal muscle so, for example, men have broader shoulders allowing more muscle to build. This translates into 44% less upper body strength for women, providing men an advantage for sports like boxing, weightlifting and skiing. In similar fashion, muscle mass differences lead to decreased trunk and lower body strength by 64% and 72%, respectively in women. These differences in body strength can have a significant impact on athletic performance, and largely underwrite the significant differences in world record times and distances set by men and women.” (Knox 2019 at 397.)

42. Meanwhile, distinctive aspects of the female pelvis geometry cut against athletic performance. “[T]he widening of the female pelvis during puberty, balancing the evolutionary demands of obstetrics and locomotion, retards the improvement in female physical performance.” (Handelsman (2018) 818.) “[T]he major female hormones, oestrogens, can have effects that disadvantage female athletic performance. For example, women have a wider pelvis changing the hip

structure significantly between the sexes. Pelvis shape is established during puberty and is driven by oestrogen. The different angles resulting from the female pelvis leads to decreased joint rotation and muscle recruitment ultimately making them slower.” (Knox 2019 at 397.)

43. Beyond simple performance, the greater density and strength of male bones provide higher protection against stresses associated with extreme physical effort: “[S]tress fractures in athletes, mostly involving the legs, are more frequent in females, with the male protection attributable to their larger and thicker bones.” (Handelsman 2018 at 818.)

C. Males have much larger muscle mass.

44. The fact that, on average, men have substantially larger muscles than women is as well known to common observation as men’s greater height. But the male advantage in muscle size has also been extensively measured. The differential is large.

45. “On average, women have 50% to 60% of men’s upper arm muscle cross-sectional area and 65% to 70% of men’s thigh muscle cross-sectional area, and women have 50% to 60% of men’s upper limb strength and 60% to 80% of men’s leg strength. Young men have on average a skeletal muscle mass of >12 kg greater than age-matched women at any given body weight.” (Handelsman 2018 at 812. See also Gooren 2011 at 653, Thibault 2010 at 214.)

46. “There is convincing evidence that the sex differences in muscle mass and strength are sufficient to account for the increased strength and aerobic performance of men compared with women and is in keeping with the differences in world records between the sexes.” (Handelsman 2018 at 816.)

47. Once again, looking at specific and comparable populations of athletes, an evaluation of NCAA Division 1 basketball players consisting of 68 male guards and 59 male forwards, compared to 105 female guards and 91 female forwards, reported that the male guards had 77.7 ± 6.4 kg of fat free mass and 7.4 ± 3.1 kg fat mass while the female guards had 54.6 ± 4.4 kg fat free mass and 13.4 ± 5.4 kg fat mass. The male forwards had 89.5 ± 5.9 kg fat free mass and 15.9 ± 5.6 kg fat mass while the female forwards had 61.8 ± 5.9 kg fat free mass and 20.5 ± 7.7 kg fat mass. (Fields 2018 at 3.)

D. Females have a larger proportion of body fat.

48. While women have smaller muscles, they have proportionately more body fat, in general a negative for athletic performance. “Oestrogens also affect body

composition by influencing fat deposition. Women, on average, have higher percentage body fat, and this holds true even for highly trained healthy athletes (men 5%–10%, women 8%–15%). Fat is needed in women for normal reproduction and fertility, but it is not performance enhancing. This means men with higher muscle mass and less body fat will normally be stronger kilogram for kilogram than women.” (Knox 2019 at 397.)

49. “[E]lite females have more (<13 vs. <5 %) body fat than males. Indeed, much of the difference in [maximal oxygen uptake] between males and females disappears when it is expressed relative to lean body mass.” “Males possess on average 7–9 % less percent body fat than females.” (Lepers 2012 at 853.)

50. Knox et al. observe that both female pelvis shape and female body fat levels “disadvantage female athletes in sports in which speed, strength and recovery are important,” (Knox 2019 at 397), while Tønnessen et al. describe the “ratio between muscular power and total body mass” as “critical” for athletic performance. (Tønnessen 2015 at 7.)

E. Males are able to metabolize and release energy to muscles at a higher rate due to larger heart and lung size, and higher hemoglobin concentrations.

51. While advantages in bone size, muscle size, and body fat are easily perceived and understood by laymen, scientists also measure and explain the male athletic advantage at a more abstract level through measurements of metabolism, or the ability to deliver energy to muscles throughout the body.

52. Energy release at the muscles depends centrally on the body’s ability to deliver oxygen to the muscles, where it is essential to the complex chain of biochemical reactions that make energy available to power muscle fibers. Men have multiple distinctive physiological attributes that together give them a large advantage in oxygen delivery.

53. Oxygen is taken into the blood in the lungs. Men have greater capability take in oxygen for multiple reasons. “[L]ung capacity [is] larger in men because of a lower diaphragm placement due to Y-chromosome genetic determinants.” (Knox 2019 at 397.) Supporting larger lung capacity, men have “greater cross-sectional area of the trachea”; that is, they can simply move more air in and out of their lungs in a given time. (Hilton 2021 at 201.)

54. More, male lungs provide superior oxygen exchange even for a given volume: “The greater lung volume is complemented by testosterone-driven **enhanced alveolar multiplication** rate during the early years of life.” “Oxygen exchange takes place between the air we breathe and the bloodstream at the alveoli,

so more alveoli allows more oxygen to pass into the bloodstream. Therefore, the greater lung capacity allows more air to be inhaled with each breath. This is coupled with an improved uptake system allowing men to absorb more oxygen.” (Knox 2019 at 397.)

55. “Once in the blood, oxygen is carried by haemoglobin. **Haemoglobin concentrations** are directly modulated by testosterone so men have higher levels and can carry more oxygen than women.” (Knox 2019 at 397.) “It is well known that levels of circulating hemoglobin are androgen-dependent and consequently higher in men than in women by 12% on average.... Increasing the amount of hemoglobin in the blood has the biological effect of increasing oxygen transport from lungs to tissues, where the increased availability of oxygen enhances aerobic energy expenditure.” (Handelsman 2018 at 816.) (See also Lepers 2013 at 853; Handelsman 2017 at 71.) “It may be estimated that as a result the average maximal oxygen transfer will be ~10% greater in men than in women, which has a direct impact on their respective athletic capacities.” (Handelsman 2018 at 816.)

56. But the male metabolic advantage is further multiplied by the fact that men are also able to **circulate more blood per second** than are women. “Oxygenated blood is pumped to the active skeletal muscle by the heart. The left ventricle chamber of the heart is the reservoir from which blood is pumped to the body. The larger the left ventricle, the more blood it can hold, and therefore, the more blood can be pumped to the body with each heartbeat, a physiological parameter called ‘stroke volume’. The female heart size is, on average, 85% that of a male resulting in the stroke volume of women being around 33% less.” (Knox 2018 at 397.) Hilton cites different studies that make the same finding, reporting that men on average can pump 30% more blood through their circulatory system per minute (“cardiac output”) than can women. (Hilton 2021 at 202.)

57. Finally, at the cell where the energy release is needed, men appear to have yet another advantage. “Additionally, there is experimental evidence that testosterone increases . . . **mitochondrial biogenesis**, myoglobin expression, and IGF-1 content, which may augment energetic and power generation of skeletal muscular activity.” (Handelsman 2018 at 811.)

58. “Putting all of this together, men have a much more efficient cardiovascular and respiratory system.” (Knox 2019 at 397.) A widely accepted measurement that reflects the combined effects all these respiratory, cardiovascular, and metabolic advantages is referred to as “ $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$,” which refers to the maximum rate at which an individual can consume oxygen during aerobic

exercise.⁶ Looking at 11 separate studies, including both trained and untrained individuals, Pate et al. concluded that men have a 50% higher $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$ than women on average, and a 25% higher $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$ in relation to body weight. (Pate 1984 at 92. See also Hilton 2021 at 202.)

⁶ $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$ is “based on hemoglobin concentration, total blood volume, maximal stroke volume, cardiac size/mass/compliance, skeletal muscle blood flow, capillary density, and mitochondrial content.” International Statement, *The Role of Testosterone in Athletic Performance* (January 2019).

III. The role of testosterone in the development of male advantages in athletic performance.

A. Boys exhibit advantages in athletic performance even before puberty.

59. It is often said or assumed that boys enjoy no significant athletic advantage over girls before puberty. However, this is not true. Writing in their seminal work on the physiology of elite young female athletes, McManus and Armstrong (2011) reviewed the differences between boys and girls regarding bone density, body composition, cardiovascular function, metabolic function, and other physiologic factors that can influence athletic performance. They stated “At birth, boys tend to have a greater lean mass than girls. This difference remains small but detectable throughout childhood with about a 10% greater lean mass in boys than girls prior to puberty” (28). “Sexual dimorphism underlies much of the physiologic response to exercise” and most importantly these authors concluded that “Young girl athletes are not simply smaller, less muscular boys.” (23)

60. Certainly, boys’ physiological and performance advantages increase rapidly from the beginning of puberty until around age 17-19. But much data and multiple studies show that significant physiological differences, and significant male athletic performance advantages in certain areas, exist before significant developmental changes associated with male puberty have occurred.

61. A very recent literature review commissioned by the five United Kingdom governmental Sport Councils concluded that while “[i]t is often assumed that children have similar physical capacity regardless of their sex, . . . large-scale data reports on children from the age of six show that young males have significant advantage in cardiovascular endurance, muscular strength, muscular endurance, speed/agility and power tests,” although they “score lower on flexibility tests.” (UK Sports Councils Literature Review 2021 at 3.)

62. Hilton et al., also writing in 2021, reached the same conclusion: “An extensive review of fitness data from over 85,000 Australian children aged 9–17 years old showed that, compared with 9-year-old females, 9-year-old males were faster over short sprints (9.8%) and 1 mile (16.6%), could jump 9.5% further from a standing start (a test of explosive power), could complete 33% more push-ups in 30 [seconds] and had 13.8% stronger grip.” (Hilton 2021 at 201, summarizing the findings of Catley & Tomkinson 2012.)

63. Tomkinson et al. (2018) performed a similarly extensive analysis of literally millions of measurements of a variety of strength and agility metrics from the “Eurofit” test battery on children from 30 European countries. They provide

detailed results for each metric, broken out by decile. Sampling the low, middle, and top decile, 9-year-old boys performed better than 9-year-old girls by between 6.5% and 9.7% in the standing broad jump; from 11.4% to 16.1% better in handgrip; and from 45.5% to 49.7% better in the “bent-arm hang.” (Tomkinson 2018.)

64. Another report published in 2014 analyzed physical fitness measurements of 10,302 children aged 6 -10.9 years of age, from the European countries of Sweden, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Cyprus, Spain, Belgium, and Estonia. (De Miguel-Etayo et al. 2014.) The authors observed “... that boys performed better than girls in speed, lower- and upper-limb strength and cardiorespiratory fitness.” (57) The data showed that for children of comparable fitness (i.e. 99th percentile boys vs. 99th percentile girls, 50th percentile boys vs. 50th percentile girls, etc.) the boys outperform the girls at every age in measurements of handgrip strength, standing long jump, 200 m shuttle run, and predicted VO₂max (pages 63 and 64, respectively). For clarification, VO₂max is the maximal oxygen consumption, which correlates to 30-40% of success in endurance sports.

65. Another study of Eurofit results for over 400,000 Greek children reported similar results. “[C]ompared with 6-year-old females, 6-year-old males completed 16.6% more shuttle runs in a given time and could jump 9.7% further from a standing position.” (Hilton 2021 at 201, summarizing findings of Tambalis et al. 2016.)

66. Silverman (2011) gathered hand grip data, broken out by age and sex, from a number of studies. Looking only at the nine direct comparisons within individual studies tabulated by Silverman for children aged 7 or younger, in eight of these the boys had strength advantages of between 13 and 28 percent, with the remaining outlier recording only a 4% advantage for 7-year-old boys. (Silverman 2011 Table 1.)

67. Boys also enjoy an advantage in throwing well before puberty. “Boys exceed girls in throwing velocity by 1.5 standard deviation units as early as 4 to 7 years of age. . . The boys exceed the girls [in throwing distance] by 1.5 standard deviation units as early as 2 to 4 years of age.” (Thomas 1985 at 266.) This means that the average 4- to 7-year-old boy can out throw approximately 87% of all girls of his age.

68. Record data from USA Track & Field indicate that boys outperform girls in track events even in the youngest age group for whom record are kept (age 8 and under).⁷

⁷<http://legacy.usatf.org/statistics/records/view.asp?division=american&location=outdoor%20track%20%26%20field&age=youth&sport=TF>

American Youth Outdoor Track & Field
Record times in age groups 8 and under (time in seconds)

Event	Boys	Girls	Difference
100M	13.65	13.78	0.95%
200M	27.32	28.21	3.26%
400M	62.48	66.10	5.79%
800M	148.59	158.11	6.41%
1500M	308.52	314.72	2.01%
Mean			3.68%

69. Looking at the best times within a single year shows a similar pattern of consistent advantage for even young boys. I consider the 2018 USATF Region 8 Junior Olympic Championships for the youngest age group (8 and under).⁸

Event	Boys	Girls	Difference
100M	15.11	15.64	3.51%
200M	30.79	33.58	9.06%
400M	71.12	77.32	8.72%
800M	174.28	180.48	3.56%
1500M	351.43	382.47	8.83%
Mean			6.74%

70. As serious runners will recognize, differences of 3%, 5%, or 8% are not easily overcome. During track competition the difference between first and second place, or second and third place, or third and fourth place (and so on) is often 0.5 - 0.7%, with some contests being determined by as little as 0.01%.

71. I performed an analysis of running events (consisting of the 100 m, 200 m, 400 m, 800 m, 1500 m, 5000 m, and 10,000 m) in the Division 1, Division 2, and Division 3 NCAA Outdoor championships for the years of 2010-2019: the mean difference between 1st and 2nd place was 0.48% for men and 0.86% for women. The mean difference between 2nd and 3rd place was 0.46% for men and 0.57% for women. The mean difference between 3rd place and 4th place was 0.31% for men and 0.44% for women. The mean difference between 1st place and 8th place (the last place to earn the title of All American) was 2.65% for men and 3.77% for women. (Brown et

⁸ <https://www.athletic.net/TrackAndField/meet/384619/results/m/1/100m>

al. Unpublished observations, to be presented at the 2022 Annual Meeting of the American College of Sports Medicine).

72. A common response to empirical data showing pre-pubertal performance advantages in boys is the argument that the performance of boys may represent a social–cultural bias for boys to be more physically active, rather than representing inherent sex-based differences in pre-pubertal physical fitness. However, the younger the age at which such differences are observed, and the more egalitarian the culture within which they are observed, the less plausible this hypothesis becomes. Eiberg et al. (2005) measured body composition, $VO_2\text{max}$, and physical activity in 366 Danish boys and 332 Danish girls between the ages of 6 and 7 years old. Their observations indicated that $VO_2\text{max}$ was 11% higher in boys than girls. When expressed relative to body mass the boys' $VO_2\text{max}$ was still 8% higher than the girls. The authors stated that "...no differences in haemoglobin or sex hormones have been reported in this age group," yet "... when children with the same $VO_2\text{max}$ were compared, boys were still more active, and in boys and girls with the same P[hysical] A[ctivity] level, boys were fitter." (728) These data indicate that in pre-pubertal children, in a very egalitarian culture regarding gender roles and gender norms, boys still have a measurable advantage in regards to aerobic fitness when known physiological and physical activity differences are accounted for.

73. And, as I have mentioned above, even by the age of 4 or 5, in a ruler-drop test, boys exhibit 4% to 6% faster reaction times than girls. (Latorre-Roman 2018.)

74. For the most part, the data I review above relate to pre-pubertal children. Today, we also face the question of inclusion in female athletics of males who have undergone "puberty suppression." The UK Sport Councils Literature Review notes that "In the UK, so-called 'puberty blockers' are generally not used until Tanner maturation stage 2-3 (i.e. after puberty has progressed into early sexual maturation)." (9.) While it is outside my expertise, my understanding is that current practice with regard to administration of puberty blockers is similar in the United States. Tanner stages 2 and 3 generally encompass an age range from 10 to 14 years old, with significant differences between individuals. Like the authors of the UK Sports Council Literature Review, I am "not aware of research" directly addressing the implications for athletic capability of the use of puberty blockers. (UK Sport Councils Literature Review at 9.) As Handelsman documents, the male advantage begins to increase rapidly—along with testosterone levels—at about age 11, or "very closely aligned to the timing of the onset of male puberty." (Handelsman 2017.) It seems likely that these individuals will have physiological and performance advantages over females somewhere between those possessed by pre-pubertal boys, and those who have gone through full male puberty, with the degree


of advantage in individual cases depending on that individual's development and the timing of the start of puberty blockade.

75. Tack et al. observed that in 21 transgender-identifying biological males, administration of antiandrogens for 5-31 months (commencing at 16.3 ± 1.21 years of age), resulted in nearly, but not completely, halting of normal age-related *increases* in muscle strength. Importantly, muscle strength did not decrease after administration of antiandrogens. Rather, despite antiandrogens, these individuals retained higher muscle mass, lower percent body fat, higher body mass, higher body height, and higher grip strength than comparable girls of the same age. (Supplemental tables).

B. The rapid increase in testosterone across male puberty drives characteristic male physiological changes and the increasing performance advantages.

76. While boys exhibit some performance advantage even before puberty, it is both true and well known to common experience that the male advantage increases rapidly, and becomes much larger, as boys undergo puberty and become men. Empirically, this can be seen by contrasting the modest advantages reviewed immediately above against the large performance advantages enjoyed by men that I have detailed in Section I.

77. Multiple studies (along with common observation) document that the male performance advantage begins to increase during the early years of puberty, and then increases rapidly across the middle years of puberty (about ages 12-16). (Tønnessen 2015; Handelsman 2018 at 812-813.) Since it is well known that testosterone levels increase by more than an order of magnitude in boys across puberty, it is unsurprising that Handelsman finds that these increases in male



performance advantage correlate to increasing testosterone levels, as presented in his chart reproduced below. (Handelsman 2018 at 812-13.)

78. Handelsman further finds that certain characteristic male changes including boys' increase in muscle mass does not begin at all until "circulating testosterone concentrations rise into the range of males at mid-puberty, which are higher than in women at any age." (Handelsman 2018 at 810.)

79. Knox et al. (2019) agree that "[i]t is well recognised that testosterone contributes to physiological factors including body composition, skeletal structure, and the cardiovascular and respiratory systems across the life span, with significant influence during the pubertal period. These physiological factors underpin strength, speed, and recovery with all three elements required to be competitive in almost all sports." (Knox 2019 at 397.) "High testosterone levels and prior male physiology provide an all-purpose benefit, and a substantial advantage. As the IAAF says, "To the best of our knowledge, there is no other genetic or biological trait encountered in female athletics that confers such a huge performance advantage." (Knox 2019 at 399.)

80. However, the undisputed fact that high (that is, normal male) levels of testosterone drive the characteristically male physiological changes that occur across male puberty does not at all imply that artificially *depressing* testosterone levels after those changes occur will reverse all or most of those changes so as to eliminate the male athletic advantage. This is an empirical question. As it turns out, the answer is that while some normal male characteristics can be changed by means of testosterone suppression, others cannot be, and all the reliable evidence indicates that males retain large athletic advantages even after long-term testosterone suppression.

IV. The available evidence shows that suppression of testosterone in a male after puberty has occurred does not substantially eliminate the male athletic advantage.

81. The 2011 “NCAA Policy on Transgender Student-Athlete Participation” requires only that males who identify as transgender be on unspecified and unquantified “testosterone suppression treatment” for “one calendar year” prior to competing in women’s events. In supposed justification of this policy, the NCAA’s Office of Inclusion asserts that “It is also important to know that any strength and endurance advantages a transgender woman arguably may have as a result of her prior testosterone levels dissipate after about one year of estrogen or testosterone-suppression therapy.” (NCAA 2011 at 8.)

82. Similarly, writing in 2018, Handelsman et al. could speculate that even though some male advantages established during puberty are “fixed and irreversible (bone size),” “the limited available prospective evidence . . . suggests that the advantageous increases in muscle and hemoglobin due to male circulating testosterone concentrations are induced or reversed during the first 12 months.” (Handelsman 2018 at 824.)

83. But these assertions or hypotheses of the NCAA and Handelsman are now strongly contradicted by the available science. In this section, I examine what is known about whether suppression of testosterone in males can eliminate physiological and performance advantages over females.

A. Empirical studies find that males retain a strong performance advantage even after lengthy testosterone suppression.

84. As my review in Section I indicates, a very large literature documents the large performance advantage enjoyed by males across a wide range of athletics. To date, only a limited number of studies have directly measured the effect of testosterone suppression and the administration of female hormones on the athletic performance of males. These studies report that testosterone suppression for a full year (and in some cases much longer) does not come close to eliminating male advantage in strength (hand grip, leg strength, and arm strength) or running speed.

Hand Grip Strength

85. As I have noted, hand grip strength is a well-accepted proxy for general strength. Multiple separate studies, from separate groups, report that males retain a large advantage in hand strength even after testosterone suppression to female levels.

86. In a longitudinal study, Van Caenegem et al. reported that males who underwent standard testosterone suppression protocols lost only 7% hand strength after 12 months of treatment, and only a cumulative 9% after two years. (Van Caenegem 2015 at 42.) As I note above, on average men exhibit in the neighborhood of 60% greater hand grip strength than women, so these small decreases do not remotely eliminate that advantage. Van Caenegem et al. document that their sample of males who elected testosterone suppression began with less strength than a control male population. Nevertheless, after one year of suppression, their study population still had hand grip only 21% less than the control male population, and thus still far higher than a female population. (Van Caenegem 2015 at 42.)

87. Scharff et al. (2019) measured grip strength in a large cohort of male-to-female subjects from before the start of hormone therapy through one year of hormone therapy. The hormone therapy included suppression of testosterone to less than 2 nml/L “in the majority of the transwomen,” (1024), as well as administration of estradiol (1021). These researchers observed a small decrease in grip strength in these subjects over that time (Fig. 2), but mean grip strength of this group remained far higher than mean grip strength of females—specifically, “After 12 months, the median grip strength of transwomen [male-to-female subjects] still falls in the 95th percentile for age-matched females.” (1026)

88. Still a third longitudinal study, looking at teen males undergoing testosterone suppression, “noted no change in grip strength after hormonal treatment (average duration 11 months) of 21 transgender girls.” (Hilton 2021 at 207, summarizing Tack 2018.)

89. In a fourth study, Lapauw et al. (2008) looked at the extreme case of testosterone suppression by studying a population of 23 biologically male individuals who had undergone at least two years of testosterone suppression, followed by sex reassignment surgery that included “orchidectomy” (that is, surgical castration), and then at least an additional three years before the study date. Comparing this group against a control of age- and height-matched healthy males, the researchers found that the individuals who had gone through testosterone suppression and then surgical castration had an average hand grip (41 kg) that was 24% weaker than the control group of healthy males. But this remains at least 25% *higher* than the average hand-grip strength of biological females as measured by Bohannon et al. (2019).

90. Summarizing these and a few other studies measuring strength loss (in most cases based on hand grip) following testosterone suppression, Hilton et al. (2021) conclude that “strength loss with 12 months of [testosterone suppression] . . . ranged from non-significant to 7%. . . . [T]he small decrease in strength in transwomen after 12-36 months of [testosterone suppression] suggests that

transwomen likely retain a strength advantage over cisgender women.” (Hilton 2021 at 205.)

Arm Strength

91. Lapauw et al. (2008) found that 3 years after surgical castration, preceded by at least two years of testosterone suppression, biologically male subjects had 33% less bicep strength than healthy male controls. (Lapauw (2008) at 1018.) Given that healthy men exhibit between 89% and 109% greater arm strength than healthy women, this leaves a very large residual arm strength advantage over biological women.

92. Roberts et al. have recently published an interesting longitudinal study one arm of which considered biological males who began testosterone suppression and cross-sex hormones while serving in the United States Air Force. (Roberts 2020.) One measured performance criterion was pushups per minute, which, while not exclusively, primarily tests arm strength under repetition. *Before* treatment, the biological male study subjects who underwent testosterone suppression could do 45% more pushups per minute than the average for all Air Force women under the age of 30 (47.3 vs. 32.5). *After* between one and two years of testosterone suppression, this group could still do 33% more pushups per minute. (Table 4.) Further, the body weight of the study group did not decline at all after one to two years of testosterone suppression (in fact rose slightly) (Table 3), and was approximately 24 pounds (11.0 kg) higher than the average for Air Force women under the age of 30. (Roberts 2020 at 3.) This means that the individuals who had undergone at least one year of testosterone suppression were not only doing 1/3 more pushups per minute, but were lifting significantly more weight with each pushup.

93. After two years of testosterone suppression, the study sample in Roberts et al. was only able to do 6% more pushups per minute than the Air Force female average. But their weight remained unchanged from their pre-treatment starting point, and thus about 24 pounds higher than the Air Force female average. As Roberts et al. explain, “as a group, transwomen weigh more than CW [cis-women]. Thus, transwomen will have a higher power output than CW when performing an equivalent number of push-ups. Therefore, our study may underestimate the advantage in strength that transwomen have over CW.” (Roberts 2020 at 4.)

Leg Strength

94. Wiik et al. (2020), in a longitudinal study that tracked 11 males from the start of testosterone suppression through 12 months after treatment initiation, found that isometric strength levels measured at the knee “were maintained over

the [study period].”⁹ (808) “At T12 [the conclusion of the one-year study], the absolute levels of strength and muscle volume were greater in [male-to-female subjects] than in . . . CW [women who had not undergone any hormonal therapy].” (Wiik 2020 at 808) In fact, Wiik et al. reported that “muscle strength after 12 months of testosterone suppression was comparable to baseline strength. As a result, transgender women remained about 50% stronger than . . . a reference group of females.” (Hilton 2021 at 207, summarizing Wiik 2020.)

95. Lapauw et al. (2008) found that 3 years after surgical castration, preceded by at least two years of testosterone suppression, subjects had peak knee torque only 25% lower than healthy male controls. (Lapauw 2008 at 1018.) Again, given that healthy males exhibit 54% greater maximum knee torque than healthy females, this leaves these individuals with a large average strength advantage over females even years after sex reassignment surgery.

Running speed

96. The most striking finding of the recent Roberts et al. study concerned running speed over a 1.5 mile distance—a distance that tests midrange endurance. Before suppression, the MtF study group ran 21% faster than the Air Force female average. After at least 2 year of testosterone suppression, these subjects still ran 12% faster than the Air Force female average. (Roberts 2020 Table 4.)

97. The specific experience of the well-known case of NCAA athlete Cece Telfer is consistent with the more statistically meaningful results of Roberts et al., further illustrating that male-to-female transgender treatment does not negate the inherent athletic performance advantages of a post-pubertal male. In 2016 and 2017 Cece Telfer competed as Craig Telfer on the Franklin Pierce University men’s track team, being ranked 200th and 390th (respectively) against other NCAA Division 2 men. “Craig” Telfer did not qualify for the National Championships in any events. Telfer did not compete in the 2018 season while undergoing testosterone suppression (per NCAA policy). In 2019 Cece Telfer competed on the Franklin Pierce University *women’s* team, qualified for the NCAA Division 2 Track and Field National Championships, and placed 1st in the women’s 400 meter hurdles and placed third in the women’s 100 meter hurdles. (For examples of the media coverage of this please see <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2019/jun/3/cece-telfer-franklin-pierce-transgenderhurdler-wi/> last accessed May 29, 2020. <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/sport/2019/06/athletics-transgender-woman-cece-telfer-who-previously-competed-as-a-man-wins-ncaa-track-championship.html> (last accessed May 29, 2020.)

⁹ Isometric strength measures muscular force production for a given amount of time at a specific joint angle but with no joint movement.

98. The table below shows the best collegiate performance times from the combined 2015 and 2016 seasons for Cece Telfer when competing as a man in men's events, and the best collegiate performance times from the 2019 season when competing as a woman in women's events. Comparing the times for the running events (in which male and female athletes run the same distance) there is no statistical difference between Telfer's "before and after" times. Calculating the difference in time between the male and female times, Telfer performed an average of 0.22% *faster* as a female. (Comparing the performance for the hurdle events (marked with H) is of questionable validity due to differences between men's and women's events in hurdle heights and spacing, and distance for the 110m vs. 100 m.) While this is simply one example, and does not represent a controlled experimental analysis, this information provides some evidence that male-to-female transgender treatment does not negate the inherent athletic performance advantages of a postpubertal male. (These times were obtained from https://www.tfrs.org/athletes/6994616/Franklin_Pierce/CeCe_Telfer.html and <https://www.tfrs.org/athletes/5108308.html>, last accessed May 29, 2020)

As Craig Telfer (male athlete)		As Cece Telfer (female athlete)	
Event	Time (seconds)	Event	Time (seconds)
55	7.01	55	7.02
60	7.67	60	7.63
100	12.17	100	12.24
200	24.03	200	24.30
400	55.77	400	54.41
55 H †	7.98	55 H †	7.91
60 H †	8.52	60 H †	8.33
110 H †	15.17	100 H †	13.41*
400 H ‡	57.34	400 H ‡	57.53**

* women's 3rd place, NCAA Division 2 National Championships

** women's 1st place, NCAA Division 2 National Championships

† men's hurdle height is 42 inches with differences in hurdle spacing between men and women

‡ men's hurdle height is 36 inches, women's height is 30 inches with the same spacing between hurdles

99. Similarly, University of Pennsylvania swimmer Lia Thomas began competing in the women's division in the fall of 2021, after previously competing for U. Penn. in the men's division. Thomas has promptly set "women's" records in 200 meter freestyle, 500 meter freestyle, and 1650 yard freestyle competitions, beating the nearest female in the 1650 yard by an unheard-of 38 seconds.

100. Harper (2015) has often been cited as “proving” that testosterone suppression eliminates male advantage. And indeed, hedged with many disclaimers, the author in that article does more or less make that claim with respect to “distance races,” while emphasizing that “the author makes no claims as to the equality of performances, pre and post gender transition, in any other sport.” (Harper 2015 at 8.) However, Harper (2015) is in effect a collection of unverified anecdotes, not science. It is built around self-reported race times from just eight self-selected transgender runners, recruited “mostly” online. How and on what websites the subjects were recruited is not disclosed, nor is anything said about how those not recruited online were recruited. Thus, there is no information to tell us whether these eight runners could in any way be representative, and the recruitment pools and methodology, which could bear on ideological bias in their self-reports, is not disclosed.

101. Further, the self-reported race times relied on by Harper (2015) *span 29 years*. It is well known that self-reported data, particularly concerning emotionally or ideologically fraught topics, is unreliable, and likewise that memory of distant events is unreliable. Whether the subjects were responding from memory or from written records, and if so what records, is not disclosed, and does not appear to be known to the author. For six of the subjects, the author claims to have been able to verify “approximately half” of the self-reported times. Which scores these are is not disclosed. The other two subjects responded only anonymously, so nothing about their claims could be or was verified. In short, neither the author nor the reader knows whether the supposed “facts” on which the paper’s analysis are based are true.

102. Even if we could accept them at face value, the data are largely meaningless. Only two of the eight study subjects reported (undefined) “stable training patterns,” and even with consistent training, athletic performance generally declines with age. As a result, when the few data points span 29 years, it is not possible to attribute declines in performance to asserted testosterone suppression. Further, distance running is usually not on a track, and race times vary significantly depending on the course and the weather. Only one reporting subject who claimed a “stable training pattern” reported “before and after” times on the same course within three years’ time,” which the author acknowledges would “represent the best comparison points.”

103. Harper (2015) to some extent acknowledges its profound methodological flaws, but seeks to excuse them by the difficulty of breaking new ground. The author states that “The first problem is how to formulate a study to create a meaningful measurement of athletic performance, both before and after testosterone suppression. No methodology has been previously devised to make meaningful measurements.” (2) This statement was not accurate at the time of publication, as there are innumerable publications with validated methodology for

comparing physical fitness and/or athletic performance between people of different ages, sexes, and before and after medical treatment, any of which could easily have been used with minimal or no adaptation for the purposes of this study. Indeed, well before the publication of Harper (2015), several authors that I have cited in this review had performed and published disciplined and methodologically reliable studies of physical performance and physiological attributes “before and after” testosterone suppression.

104. More recently, and to her credit, Harper has acknowledged the finding of Roberts (2020) regarding the durable male advantage in running speed in the 1.5 mile distance, even after two years of testosterone suppression. She joins with co-authors in acknowledging that this study of individuals who (due to Air Force physical fitness requirements) “could at least be considered exercise trained,” agrees that Roberts’ data shows that “transwomen ran significantly faster during the 1.5 mile fitness test than ciswomen,” and declares that this result is “consistent with the findings of the current review in untrained transgender individuals” that even 30 months of testosterone suppression does not eliminate all male advantages “associated with muscle endurance and performance.” (Harper 2021 at 8.) The Harper (2021) authors conclude overall “that strength may be well preserved in transwomen during the first 3 years of hormone therapy,” and that [w]hether transgender and cisgender women can engage in meaningful sport [in competition with each other], even after [testosterone suppression], is a highly debated question.” (Harper 2021 at 1, 8.)

B. Testosterone suppression does not reverse important male physiological advantages.

105. We see that, once a male has gone through male puberty, later testosterone suppression (or even castration) leaves large strength and performance advantages over females in place. It is not surprising that this is so. What is now a fairly extensive body of literature has documented that many of the specific male physiological advantages that I reviewed in Section II are not reversed by testosterone suppression after puberty, or are reduced only modestly, leaving a large advantage over female norms still in place.

106. Handelsman has well documented that the large increases in physiological and performance advantages characteristic of men develop in tandem with, and are likely driven by, the rapid and large increases in circulating testosterone levels that males experience across puberty, or generally between the ages of about 12 through 18. (Handelsman 2018.) Some have misinterpreted Handelsman as suggesting that all of those advantages are and remain entirely dependent—on an ongoing basis—on *current* circulating testosterone levels. This is a misreading of Handelsman, who makes no such claim. As the studies reviewed

above demonstrate, it is also empirically false with respect to multiple measures of performance. Indeed, Handelsman himself, referring to the Roberts et al. (2020) study which I describe below, has recently written that “transwomen treated with estrogens after completing male puberty experienced only minimal declines in physical performance over 12 months, substantially surpassing average female performance for up to 8 years.” (Handelsman 2020.)

107. As to individual physiological advantages, the more accurate and more complicated reality is reflected in a statement titled “The Role of Testosterone in Athletic Performance,” signed in 2018 by several dozen sports medicine experts and physicians from many top medical schools and hospitals in the U.S. and around the world. (Levine et al. 2018.) This expert group concurs with Handelsman regarding the importance of testosterone to the male advantage, but recognizes that those advantages depend not only on *current* circulating testosterone levels in the individual, but on the “exposure in biological males to much higher levels of testosterone during growth, development, and throughout the athletic career.” (*Emphasis added.*) In other words, both past and current circulating testosterone levels affect physiology and athletic capability.

108. Available research enables us to sort out, in some detail, which specific physiological advantages are immutable once they occur, which can be reversed only in part, and which appear to be highly responsive to later hormonal manipulation. The bottom line is that very few of the male physiological advantages I have reviewed in Section II above are largely reversible by testosterone suppression once an individual has passed through male puberty.

Skeletal Configuration

109. It is obvious that some of the physiological changes that occur during “growth and development” across puberty cannot be reversed. Some of these irreversible physiological changes are quite evident in photographs that have recently appeared in the news of transgender competitors in female events. These include skeletal configuration advantages including:

- Longer and larger bones that give height, weight, and leverage advantages to men;
- More advantageous hip shape and configuration as compared to women.

Cardiovascular Advantages

110. Developmental changes for which there is no apparent means of reversal, and no literature suggesting reversibility, also include multiple

contributors to the male cardiovascular advantage, including diaphragm placement, lung and trachea size, and heart size and therefore pumping capacity.¹⁰

111. On the other hand, the evidence is mixed as to hemoglobin concentration, which as discussed above is a contributing factor to $\dot{V}O_2$ max. Harper (2020) surveyed the literature and found that “Nine studies reported the levels of Hgb [hemoglobin] or HCT [red blood cell count] in transwomen before and after [testosterone suppression], from a minimum of three to a maximum of 36 months post hormone therapy. Eight of these studies. . . found that hormone therapy led to a significant (4.6%–14.0%) decrease in Hgb/HCT ($p < 0.01$), while one study found no significant difference after 6 months,” but only one of those eight studies returned results at the generally accepted 95% confidence level. (Harper 2020 at 5-6 and Table 5.)

112. I have not found any study of the effect of testosterone suppression on the male advantage in mitochondrial biogenesis.

Muscle mass

113. Multiples studies have found that muscle mass decreases modestly or not at all in response to testosterone suppression. Knox et al. report that “healthy young men did not lose significant muscle mass (or power) when their circulating testosterone levels were reduced to 8.8 nmol/L (lower than the 2015 IOC guideline of 10 nmol/L) for 20 weeks.” (Knox 2019 at 398.) Gooren found that “[i]n spite of muscle surface area reduction induced by androgen deprivation, after 1 year the mean muscle surface area in male-to- female transsexuals remained significantly greater than in untreated female-to-male transsexuals.” (Gooren 2011 at 653.) An earlier study by Gooren found that after one year of testosterone suppression, muscle mass at the thigh was reduced by only about 10%, exhibited “no further reduction after 3 years of hormones,” and “remained significantly greater” than in his sample of untreated women. (Gooren 2004 at 426-427.) Van Caenegem et al. found that muscle cross section in the calf and forearm decreased only trivially (4% and 1% respectively) after two years of testosterone suppression. (Van Caenegem 2015 Table 4.)

114. Taking measurements one month after start of testosterone suppression in male-to-female (non-athlete) subjects, and again 3 and 11 months after start of feminizing hormone replacement therapy in these subjects, Wiik et al.

¹⁰ “[H]ormone therapy will not alter ... lung volume or heart size of the transwoman athlete, especially if [that athlete] transitions postpuberty, so natural advantages including joint articulation, stroke volume and maximal oxygen uptake will be maintained.” (Knox 2019 at 398.)

found that total lean tissue (i.e. primarily muscle) did not decrease significantly across the entire period. Indeed, “some of the [subjects] did not lose any muscle mass at all.” (Wiik 2020 at 812) And even though they observed a small decrease in thigh muscle mass, they found that isometric strength levels measured at the knee “were maintained over the [study period].” (808) “At T12 [the conclusion of the one-year study], the absolute levels of strength and muscle volume were greater in [male-to-female subjects] than in [female-to-male subjects] and CW [women who had not undergone any hormonal therapy].” (808)

115. Hilton & Lundberg summarize an extensive survey of the literature as follows:

“12 longitudinal studies have examined the effects of testosterone suppression on lean body mass or muscle size in transgender women. The collective evidence from these studies suggests that 12 months, which is the most commonly examined intervention period, of testosterone suppression to female typical reference levels results in a modest (approximately– 5%) loss of lean body mass or muscle size. . . .

“Thus, given the large baseline differences in muscle mass between males and females (Table 1; approximately 40%), the reduction achieved by 12 months of testosterone suppression can reasonably be assessed as small relative to the initial superior mass. We, therefore, conclude that the muscle mass advantage males possess over females, and the performance implications thereof, are not removed by the currently studied durations (4 months, 1, 2 and 3 years) of testosterone suppression in transgender women. (Hilton 2021 at 205-207.)

116. When we recall that “women have 50% to 60% of men’s upper arm muscle cross-sectional area and 65% to 70% of men’s thigh muscle cross-sectional area” (Handelsman 2018 at 812), it is clear that Hilton’s conclusion is correct. In other words, biologically male subjects possess substantially larger muscles than biologically female subjects after undergoing a year or even three years of testosterone suppression.

117. I note that outside the context of transgender athletes, the testosterone-driven increase in muscle mass and strength enjoyed by these male-to-female subjects would constitute a disqualifying doping violation under all league anti-doping rules with which I am familiar.

Body fat

118. Body fat appears to respond significantly to testosterone suppression, although causation is difficult to assign with confidence due to behavioral and psychological factors. While Van Caenegem's subjects (who were not athletes) did not experience significant loss of lean body mass, they did show an average increase of total body fat of 34% two years after the beginning of suppression. (Van Caenegem 2015 Table 4.)

C. Responsible voices internationally are increasingly recognizing that suppression of testosterone in a male after puberty has occurred does not substantially reverse the male athletic advantage.

119. The current very permissive NCAA policy governing transgender participation in women's collegiate athletics was adopted in 2011, and the previous IOC guidelines were adopted in 2015. At those dates, much of the scientific analysis of the actual impact of testosterone suppression had not yet been performed, much less any wider synthesis of that science. In fact, a series of important peer-reviewed studies and literature reviews have been published only very recently, since I prepared my first paper on this topic, in early 2020.

120. These new scientific publications reflect a remarkably consistent consensus: once an individual has gone through male puberty, testosterone suppression does not substantially eliminate the physiological and performance advantages that that individual enjoys over female competitors.

121. Importantly, I have found no peer-reviewed scientific paper, nor any respected scientific voice, that is now asserting the contrary—that is, that testosterone suppression can eliminate or even largely eliminate the male biological advantage once puberty has occurred.

122. I excerpt the key conclusions from important recent peer-reviewed papers below.

123. Roberts 2020: "In this study, we confirmed that . . . the pretreatment differences between transgender and cis gender women persist beyond the 12-month time requirement currently being proposed for athletic competition by the World Athletics and the IOC." (6)

124. Wiik 2020: The muscular and strength changes in males undergoing testosterone suppression "were modest. The question of when it is fair to permit a transgender woman to compete in sport in line with her experienced gender identity is challenging." (812)

125. Harper 2021: “[V]alues for strength, LBM [lean body mass], and muscle area in transwomen remain above those of cisgender women, even after 36 months of hormone therapy.” (1)

126. Hilton & Lundberg 2021: “evidence for loss of the male performance advantage, established by testosterone at puberty and translating in elite athletes to a 10–50% performance advantage, is lacking. . . . These data significantly undermine the delivery of fairness and safety presumed by the criteria set out in transgender inclusion policies . . .” (211)

127. Hamilton et al. 2020, “Response to the United Nations Human Rights Council’s Report on Race and Gender Discrimination in Sport: An Expression of Concern and a Call to Prioritize Research”: “There is growing support for the idea that development influenced by high testosterone levels may result in retained anatomical and physiological advantages If a biologically male athlete self-identifies as a female, legitimately with a diagnosis of gender dysphoria or illegitimately to win medals, the athlete already possesses a physiological advantage that undermines fairness and safety. This is not equitable, nor consistent with the fundamental principles of the Olympic Charter.”

128. Hamilton et al. 2021, “Consensus Statement of the Fédération Internationale de Médecine du Sport” (International Federation of Sports Medicine, or IFSM), signed by more than 60 sports medicine experts from prestigious institutions around the world: The available studies “make it difficult to suggest that the athletic capabilities of transwomen individuals undergoing HRT or GAS are comparable to those of cisgender women.” The findings of Roberts et al. “question the required testosterone suppression time of 12 months for transwomen to be eligible to compete in women’s sport, as most advantages over ciswomen were not negated after 12 months of HRT.”

129. Outside the forum of peer-reviewed journals, respected voices in sport are reaching the same conclusion.

130. The **Women’s Sports Policy Working Group** identifies among its members and “supporters” many women Olympic medalists, former women’s tennis champion and LGBTQ activist Martina Navratilova, Professor Doriane Coleman, a former All-American women’s track competitor, transgender athletes Joanna Harper and Dr. Renee Richards, and many other leaders in women’s sports and civil rights. I have referenced other published work of Joanna Harper and Professor Coleman. In early 2021 the Women’s Sports Policy Working Group published a “Briefing Book” on the issue of transgender participation in women’s sports,¹¹ in

¹¹ <https://womenssportspolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Congressional-Briefing-WSPWG-Transgender-Women-Sports-2.27.21.pdf>

which they reviewed largely the same body of literature I have reviewed above, and analyzed the implications of that science for fairness and safety in women's sports.

131. Among other things, the Women's Sports Policy Working Group concluded:

- “[T]he evidence is increasingly clear that hormones do not eliminate the legacy advantages associated with male physical development” (8) due to “the considerable size and strength advantages that remain even after hormone treatments or surgical procedures.” (17)
- “[T]here is convincing evidence that, depending on the task, skill, sport, or event, trans women maintain male sex-linked (legacy) advantages even after a year on standard gender-affirming hormone treatment.” (26, citing Roberts 2020.)
- “[S]everal peer-reviewed studies, including one based on data from the U.S. military, have confirmed that trans women retain their male sex-linked advantages even after a year on gender affirming hormones. . . . Because of these retained advantages, USA Powerlifting and World Rugby have recently concluded that it isn't possible fairly and safely to include trans women in women's competition.” (32)

132. As has been widely reported, in 2020, after an extensive scientific consultation process, the **World Rugby** organization issued its Transgender Guideline, finding that it would not be consistent with fairness or safety to permit biological males to compete in World Rugby women's matches, no matter what hormonal or surgical procedures they might have undergone. Based on their review of the science, World Rugby concluded:

- “Current policies regulating the inclusion of transgender women in sport are based on the premise that reducing testosterone to levels found in biological females is sufficient to remove many of the biologically-based performance advantages described above. However, peer-reviewed evidence suggests that this is not the case.” (15)
- “Longitudinal research studies on the effect of reducing testosterone to female levels for periods of 12 months or more do not support the contention that variables such as mass, lean mass and strength are altered meaningfully in comparison to the original male-female differences in these variables. The lowering of testosterone removes only a small proportion of the documented biological differences, with large, retained advantages in these physiological attributes, with the safety and performance implications described previously.” (17)

- “. . . given the size of the biological differences prior to testosterone suppression, this comparatively small effect of testosterone reduction allows substantial and meaningful differences to remain. This has significant implications for the risk of injury” (2)
- “. . . bone mass is typically maintained in transgender women over the course of at Least 24 months of testosterone suppression, Height and other skeletal measurements such as bone length and hip width have also not been shown to change with testosterone suppression, and nor is there any plausible biological mechanism by which this might occur, and so sporting advantages due to skeletal differences between males and females appear unlikely to change with testosterone reduction. (16)

133. In September 2021, as I was preparing this revised and updated paper, the government-commissioned Sports Councils of the United Kingdom and its subsidiary parts (England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland) issued formal “Guidance for Transgender Inclusion in Domestic Sport” (UK Sport Councils 2021), following an extensive consultation process, and a commissioned “International Research Literature Review” prepared by the Carbmill Consulting group (UK Sport Literature Review 2021). The UK Sport Literature Review identified largely the same relevant literature that I review in this paper, characterizes that literature consistently with my own reading and description, and based on that science reaches conclusions similar to mine.

134. The UK Sport Literature Review 2021 concluded:

- “Sexual dimorphism in relation to sport is significant and the most important determinant of sporting capacity. The challenge to sporting bodies is most evident in the inclusion of transgender people in female sport.” “[The] evidence suggests that parity in physical performance in relation to gender-affected sport cannot be achieved for transgender people in female sport through testosterone suppression. Theoretical estimation in contact and collision sport indicate injury risk is likely to be increased for female competitors.” (10)
- “From the synthesis of current research, the understanding is that testosterone suppression for the mandated one year before competition will result in little or no change to the anatomical differences between the sexes, and a more complete reversal of some acute phase metabolic pathways such as haemoglobin levels although the impact on running performance appears limited, and a modest change in muscle mass and strength: The average of around 5% loss of muscle mass and strength

will not reverse the average 40-50% difference in strength that typically exists between the two sexes.” (7)

- “These findings are at odds with the accepted intention of current policy in sport, in which twelve months of testosterone suppression is expected to create equivalence between transgender women and females.” (7)

135. Taking into account the science detailed in the UK Sport Literature Review 2021, the UK Sports Councils have concluded:

- “[T]he latest research, evidence and studies made clear that there are retained differences in strength, stamina and physique between the average woman compared with the average transgender woman or non-binary person registered male at birth, with or without testosterone suppression.” (3)
- “Competitive fairness cannot be reconciled with self-identification into the female category in gender-affected sport.” (7)
- “As a result of what the review found, the Guidance concludes that the inclusion of transgender people into female sport cannot be balanced regarding transgender inclusion, fairness and safety in gender-affected sport where there is meaningful competition. This is due to retained differences in strength, stamina and physique between the average woman compared with the average transgender woman or non-binary person assigned male at birth, with or without testosterone suppression.” (6)
- “Based upon current evidence, testosterone suppression is unlikely to guarantee fairness between transgender women and natal females in gender-affected sports. . . . Transgender women are on average likely to retain physical advantage in terms of physique, stamina, and strength. Such physical differences will also impact safety parameters in sports which are combat, collision or contact in nature.” (7)

CONCLUSIONS

Until recently, all sporting bodies of which I am aware had addressed the question of transgender inclusion in female sport have been based on the assumption identified by the World Rugby and UK Sport Councils—“the premise that reducing testosterone to levels found in biological females is sufficient to remove many of the biologically-based performance advantages.” (World Rugby 2020 at 15.) Disagreements centered around what the appropriate threshold level must be—whether the 10nmol/liter value adopted by the IOC in 2015, or the 5nmol/liter value adopted by the IAAF.

But the science that has become available within just the last few years contradicts that premise. Instead, as the UK Sports Councils, World Rugby, the IFSM Consensus Statement, and the Women’s Sports Policy Working Group have all recognized the science is now sharply “at odds with the accepted intention of current policy in sport, in which twelve months of testosterone suppression is expected to create equivalence between transgender women and females” (Carbmill Literature Review 2021 at 7), and it is now “difficult to suggest that the athletic capabilities of transwomen individuals undergoing HRT or GAS are comparable to those of cisgender women” (IFSM Consensus Statement 2021). It is important to note that while the 2021 “IOC Framework on Fairness, Inclusion, and Non-Discrimination on the Basis of Gender Identity and Sex Variations” calls for an “evidence-based approach,” that Framework does not actually reference *any* of the now extensive scientific evidence relating to the physiological differences between the sexes, and the inefficacy of hormonal intervention to eliminate male advantages relevant to most sports. Instead, the IOC calls on other sporting bodies to define criteria for transgender inclusion, while self-righteously demanding that such criteria simultaneously ensure fairness, safety, and inclusion for all.

But what we currently know tells us that these policy goals are irreconcilable for many or most sports. Long human experience is now joined by large numbers of research papers that document that males outperform females in muscle strength, muscular endurance, aerobic and anaerobic power output, VO₂max, running speed, swimming speed, vertical jump height, reaction time, and most other measures of physical fitness and physical performance that are essential for athletic success. The male advantages have been observed in fitness testing in children as young as 3 years old, with the male advantages increasing immensely during puberty. To ignore what we know to be true about males’ athletic advantages over females, based on mere hope or speculation that cross-sex hormone use might neutralize that advantage, when the currently available evidence says it does not, is not science and is not “evidence-based” policy-making.

The scientific facts confront us with a question of priorities. If males are permitted to participate in female athletics, with or without testosterone suppression, this can only be justified by a decision that inclusion of transgender individuals is more important than fairness (and in sports involving contact, safety) for those individuals born female, and indeed that fairness and safety for biological women must be sacrificed in the service of inclusion. On the other hand, if this policy choice is rejected, then the currently available science tells us that, due the many sexual dimorphisms of the human species, sport must continue to be separated along the long-standing line of biological sex.

Bibliography

- Bohannon, R.W. et al., *Handgrip strength: a comparison of values obtained from the NHANES and NIH toolbox studies*. Am. J. Occ. Therapy 73(2) (March/April 2019).
- Catley, M. and G. Tomkinson, *Normative health-related fitness values for children: analysis of 85,437 test results on 9-17-year-old Australians since 1985*. Br. J. Sports Med. published online October 21, 2011. Bjsm.bmj.com.
- Chu, Y. et al., *Biomechanical comparison between elite female and male baseball pitchers*. J. App. Biomechanics 25:22-31 (2009).
- Coleman, D.L. and W. Shreve, *Comparing athletic performances: the best elite women to boys and men*. web.law.duke.edu/sites/default/files/centers/sportslaw/comparingathleticperformances.pdf. (Accessed 06/20/21)
- Coleman, D. L. et al., *Re-affirming the value of the sports exception to Title IX's general non-discrimination rule*. Duke J. of Gender and Law Policy 27(69):69-134 (2020).
- DiMiguel-Etayo, P. et al., *Physical fitness reference standards in European children: the IDEFICS study*. Int. J. Obes (Lond) 38(2):557-566 (2014).
- Dogan, B., *Multiple-choice reaction and visual perception in female and male elite athletes*. J. Sports Med. and Physical Fitness 49:91-96 (2009).
- Eiberg, S. et al, *Maximum oxygen uptake and objectively measured physical activity in Danish children 6-7 years of age: the Copenhagen school child intervention study*. Br J Sports Med 39:725-30 (2005).
- Fields J. et al., *Seasonal and Longitudinal Changes in Body Composition by Sport-Position in NCAA Division I Basketball Athletes*. Sports (Basel). 22:6 (2018).
- Gooren, L., *The significance of testosterone for fair participation of the female sex in competitive sports*, 13 Asian J. of Andrology 653 (2011).
- Gooren, L., et al., *Transsexuals and competitive sports*. Eur. J. Endocrinol. 151:425-9 (2004).
- Hamilton, B. et al, *Integrating transwomen and female athletes with differences of sex development (DSD) into elite competition: the FIMS 2021 consensus statement*. Sports Med 2021. doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01451-8.

- Hamilton, B. et al., *Response to the United Nations Human Rights Council's report on race and gender discrimination in sport: an expression of concern and a call to prioritise research*. Sports Med 2020. doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01380-4.
- Handelsman, D.J. et al., *Circulating testosterone as the hormonal basis of sex differences in athletic performance*. Endocrine Reviews 39(5):803-829 (Oct 2018).
- Handelsman, D.J., *Sex differences in athletic performance emerge coinciding with the onset of male puberty*, 87 Clinical Endocrinology 68 (2017).
- Handelsman, D.J., "Perspective," at <https://www.healio.com/news/endocrinology/20201216/transgender-women-outpace-cisgender-women-in-athletic-tests-after-1-year-on-hormones> (last accessed September 29, 2021).
- Harper, J. et al., *How does hormone transition in transgender women change body composition, muscle strength and haemoglobin? Systematic review with a focus on the implications for sport participation*. Br J Sports Med 55(15):865-872 (2021).
- Harper, J., *Race time for transgender athletes*. J. Sporting Cultures & Identities 6:1 (2015).
- Hilton, E. N. and T.R. Lundberg, *Transgender women in the female category of sport: perspectives on testosterone suppression and performance advantage*. Sports Medicine 51:199-214 (2021).
- Hubal, M., H. Gordish-Dressman, P. Thompson, et al., *Variability in muscle size and strength gain after unilateral resistance training*, Med & Sci in Sports & Exercise 964 (2005).
- Jain, A. et al., *A comparative study of visual and auditory reaction times on the basis of gender and physical activity levels of medical first year students*. Int J App & Basic Med Res 5:2(124-27) (May-Aug 2015).
- Knechtle, B., P. T. Nikolaidis et al., *World single age records in running from 5 km to marathon*, Frontiers in Psych 9(1) (2013).
- Knox, T., L.C. Anderson, et al., *Transwomen in elite sport: scientific & ethical considerations*, 45 J. Med Ethics 395 (2019).
- Lapauw, B. et al., *Body composition, volumetric and areal bone parameters in male-to-female transsexual persons*. Bone 43:1016-21 (2008).

- Latorre-Roman, P. et al., *Reaction times of preschool children on the ruler drop test: a cross-sectional study with reference values*. *Perceptual & Motor Skills* 125(5):866-78 (2018).
- Lepers, R., B. Knechtle et al., *Trends in triathlon performance: effects of sex & age*, *43 Sports Med* 851 (2013).
- Levine, B., M. Joyner et al., *The role of testosterone in athletic performance*. Available at https://web.law.duke.edu/sites/default/files/centers/sportslaw/Experts_T_Statement_2019.pdf (January 2019)
- Leyk, D, W. Gorges et al., *Hand-grip strength of young men, women and highly trained female athletes*, *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2007 Mar; 99(4):415-21 (2007).
- McManus, A. and N. Armstrong, *Physiology of elite young female athletes*. *J Med & Sport Sci* 56:23-46 (2011).
- Millard-Stafford, M. et al., *Nature versus nurture: have performance gaps between men and women reached an asymptote?* *Int'l J. Sports Physiol. & Performance* 13:530-35 (2018).
- Mormile, M. et al., *The role of gender in neuropsychological assessment in healthy adolescents*. *J Sports Rehab* 27:16-21 (2018).
- Morris, J. et al., *Sexual dimorphism in human arm power and force: implications for sexual selection on fighting ability*. *J Exp Bio* 223 (2020).
- National Collegiate Athletic Association, *Inclusion of transgender student-athletes*. https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Transgender_Handbook_2011_Final.pdf (August 2011).
- Neder, J.A. et al., *Reference values for concentric knee isokinetic strength and power in nonathletic men and women from 20 to 80 years old*. *J. Orth. & Sports Phys. Therapy* 29(2):116-126 (1999).
- Pate, R. and A. Kriska, *Physiological basis of the sex difference in cardiorespiratory endurance*. *Sports Med* 1:87-98 (1984).
- Roberts, T.A. et al., *Effect of gender affirming hormones on athletic performance in transwomen and transmen: implications for sporting organisations and legislators*. *Br J Sports Med* published online at [10.1136/bjsports-2020-102329](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-102329) (Dec. 7, 2020)

- Roser, M., Cameron Appel and Hannah Ritchie (2013) "Human Height". Published online at OurWorldInData.org. Retrieved from: <https://ourworldindata.org/human-height> [Online Resource]
- Sakamoto, K. et al., *Comparison of kicking speed between female and male soccer players*. *Procedia Eng* 72:50-55 (2014).
- Sattler, T. et al., *Vertical jump performance of professional male and female volleyball players: effects of playing position and competition level*. *J Strength & Cond Res* 29(6):1486-93 (2015).
- Scharff, M. et al., *Change in grip strength in trans people and its association with lean body mass and bone density*. *Endocrine Connections* 8:1020-28 (2019).
- Silverman, I., *The secular trend for grip strength in Canada and the United States*, *J Sports Sci* 29(6):599-606 (2011).
- Spieler, D. et al., *Gender influence on response time to sensory stimuli*. *J Strength & Cond Res* 24:4(957-63) (2010).
- Tack, L.J.W. et al., *Proandrogenic and antiandrogenic progestins in transgender youth: differential effects on body composition and bone metabolism*. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab*, 103(6):2147-56 (2018).
- Tambalis, K. et al., *Physical fitness normative values for 6-18-year-old Greek boys and girls, using the empirical distribution and the lambda, mu, and sigma statistical method*. *Eur J Sports Sci* 16:6(736-46) (2015).
- Thibault, V., M. Guillaume et al., *Women and men in sport performance: the gender gap has not evolved since 1983*. *J Sports Science & Med* 9:214-223 (2010).
- Thomas, J.R. and K. E. French, *Gender differences across age in motor performance: a meta-analysis*. *Psych. Bull.* 98(2):260-282 (1985).
- Tomkinson, G. et al., *European normative values for physical fitness in children and adolescents aged 9-17 years: results from 2,779,165 Eurofit performances representing 30 countries*. *Br J Sports Med* 52:1445-56 (2018).
- Tønnessen, E., I. S. Svendsen et al., *Performance development in adolescent track & field athletes according to age, sex, and sport discipline*. *PLoS ONE* 10(6): e0129014 (2015).
- Tønnessen, E. et al., *Reaction time aspects of elite sprinters in athletic world championships*. *J Strength & Cond Res* 27(4):885-92 (2013).

United Kingdom Sports Councils, *Guidance for transgender inclusion in domestic sport*. Available at [https://equalityinsport.org/docs/300921/Guidance for Transgender Inclusion in Domestic Sport 2021 - Summary of Background Documents.pdf](https://equalityinsport.org/docs/300921/Guidance%20for%20Transgender%20Inclusion%20in%20Domestic%20Sport%202021%20-%20Summary%20of%20Background%20Documents.pdf). September 2021.

VanCaenegem, E. et al, *Preservation of volumetric bone density and geometry in trans women during cross-sex hormonal therapy: a prospective observational study*. *Osteoporos Int* 26:35-47 (2015).

Wiik, A., T. R Lundberg et al., *Muscle strength, size, and composition following 12 months of gender-affirming treatment in transgender individuals*. *J. Clinical Endocrin. & Metab.* 105(3):e805-813 (2020).

Women's Sports Policy Working Group, *Briefing book: a request to Congress and the administration to preserve girls' and women's sport and accommodate transgender athletes*. Available at [womenssportspolicy.org](https://www.womenssportspolicy.org). (2021).

World Rugby Transgender Guideline. <https://www.world.rugby/the-game/player-welfare/guidelines/transgender> (2020).